IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION WP NO. 3 OF 2006

MR. SHYAMSUNDAR P. KAREKAR, MAPUSA GOA. ....Petitioner

Versus

THE CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS., ...Respondents

Mr. A. N. S. Nadkarni, Amicus Curiae.
Mr. S. S. Kantak, Advocate General with Ms. L. Dharwadkar, Additional Government Advocate for the Respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Mr. C. A. Ferreira, Assistant Solicitor General for the Respondent No.3.

Coram:- S.K. SHAH &
N. A. BRITTO, JJ.

Date:- 26th February, 2007

P.C.:-

Heard the learned Counsel on both sides.

We have perused the affidavits filed on behalf of the respondent nos.1 and 2. We are satisfied with the various publications and various steps taken by the respondent no.1 towards control over accidents. We have also noticed the publications made on 31-10-2006 and 11-10-2006.

The learned Amicus Curiae however, submits that Rule 106 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 and the figure given in Annexure VII in table below Rule 62(1) for checking head light beams, he submits that this figure is required to be published and it is necessary to bring to the notice of the public at what levels the head light beams are to be kept. Rule 106 specifies the deflection of lights at various levels. It is further suggested that it is necessary to publish the beams focus in Annexure VII and the contents of the Rule so that the vehicles would keep their head

lights deflected which, will reduce the accidents. On this suggestion the learned Advocate General accepts the same and undertakes to publish the same and the contents of Rule 106 suitably. We expect that the same will be done within two weeks from today.

With this, nothing survives in the Writ Petition as the learned Advocate General has assured to comply with all the earlier directions given and the assurances given in the affidavits in reply from time to time.

Writ Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

S.K. SHAH, J.

N. A. BRITTO, J.

RD.